## For the Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

v.

IN	THE U	NITED ST	ATES I	DISTRICT	COURT	
F∩R ′	THE NO	RTHFRN	DISTRI	CT OF C	ALIFORN	TΔ

FRANK AND DEBORAH MCDOWELL,

No. C 11-02569 CRB

Plaintiff-Appellants,

ORDER DENYING (1) MOTION FOR PPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL: (2) REQUEST FOR TRANSCRIPT ÁT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Defendant-Appellee.

On January 24, 2012, the Court granted Plaintiff-Appellants' Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, in conjunction with their Notice of Appeal to the United States Court of Appeal for the Ninth Circuit. Plaintiff-Appellants have now filed (1) a motion for the appointment of counsel to represent them on appeal, and (2) a request that transcripts be provided to them at government expense.

The motion for appointment of counsel is denied, as there is no constitutional right to counsel in a civil case. See United States v. 30.64 Acres of Land, 795 F.2d 796, 801 (9th Cir. 1986).

The request for transcripts is also denied. To the extent that Plaintiff-Appellants believe that their in forma pauperis status entitles them to free copies of transcripts, that is incorrect. See Bonner v. Henderson, 517 F.2d 135, 136 (5th Cir. 1975). Although a litigant proceeding in forma pauperis might be entitled to an order providing him free transcripts if a

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

26

27

28

notice of appeal is filed, such order is proper only if a court certifies that the appeal is "not
frivolous" and that the transcript is needed to decide the issue presented by the appeal.
See 28 U.S.C. § 753(f). Plaintiff-Appellants have filed a Notice of Appeal, but have made no
showing that their appeal is nonfrivolous or that the transcripts are needed to decide the
issues presented.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 16, 2012



## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE